

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 16, 2007 has been carefully considered. Within the Office Action, Claims 20-42 have been rejected. The Applicants hereby amend Claims 21, 31-33 and 40 and have cancelled Claim 41. Reconsideration in view of the above claims and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 20-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

However, to expedite prosecution, Claims 21 and 31-33 have been amended to better point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regards as patentable embodiments. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 20-42.

Rejection under U.S.C. § 102

Claims 40-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,637,561 to Edberg or U.S. Patent No. 4,214,713 to Wright. The Applicants respectfully traverse both of these rejections. However, to expedite prosecution of the present application, Claim 40 has been amended to include the limitation of Claim 41. Accordingly, Claim 40 is now in a condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Claims 21-29, 31-39 and 42 are dependent upon independent Claims 20, 30 and 40, respectively. For at least the reasons stated above, Claims 20, 30 and 40 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the dependent claims are allowable for being dependent on allowable base claims.

Conclusion


It is believed that this Reply places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Reply is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/15/07


Suvashis Bhattacharya
Reg. No. 46,554

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040